



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

319, 320, 107 N. Y. Supp. 621, 622. Under neither view has the practice been used for any purpose other than to procure the testimony or deposition of a witness otherwise unavailable. See WEEKS ON DEPOSITIONS, § 128. And the execution of letters rogatory rests entirely upon principles of comity. Under the theory of our law a personal judgment against a non-resident is a nullity without personal service of process. *Pennoyer v. Neff*, 95 U. S. 714. And service out of the jurisdiction, even though accepted, is not sufficient. *Scott v. Noble*, 72 Pa. St. 115. Accordingly, in the principal case, if service of process were necessary to give the Mexican court jurisdiction, the federal court was clearly correct in refusing to aid in effecting a result contrary to the policy of our legal system. *Emery v. Burbank*, 163 Mass. 326. If the purpose were merely the protection of the defendant, this result is accomplished without danger of prejudice by giving him informal notice of receipt of the request. The same conclusion was reached by the New York courts in a similar case. *Matter of Romero, supra*.

**CORPORATIONS — STOCKHOLDERS: POWERS OF MAJORITY — EXPULSION OF COMPETING SHAREHOLDERS BY AMENDING BY-LAWS.** — Section 13 of the Companies Act of 1908 (8 Edw. VII, c. 69) permits a company to introduce into its altered articles anything that might have been included in its general articles. A company in pursuance of this power *bona fide* passed an amendment which provided that the directors could require any shareholder who competed with the company's business to transfer his shares to nominees of the directors. The plaintiffs, minority shareholders, carried on a competing business, and a declaration is sought by them that the alteration was invalid as against them. *Held*, that the alteration is valid. *Sidebottom v. Kershaw Leese & Co., Ltd.*, [1920] 1 Ch. 154.

Where a contract with a member of a corporation either expressly or impliedly is made subject to future by-laws as well as to those already existing, a later amendment becomes a binding portion of the contract. *Fullenwider v. Sup. Council R. L.*, 180 Ill. 621, 54 N. E. 485; *Stohr v. San Francisco M. F.*, 82 Cal. 57, 22 Pac. 1125; *Allen v. Gold Reefs of West Africa*, [1900] 1 Ch. 656. Not every alteration, however, will be sustained; the power of change must not be exercised unreasonably. 1 MACHEN, CORPORATIONS, § 702; Boisot, BY-LAWS, § 123. Thus by-laws which impair vested rights have been held invalid in the United States, though precisely what constitutes a vested right is the subject of much confusion. *Supreme Council A. L. H. v. Champe*, 127 Fed. 541; *Weber v. Supreme Tent K. M. W.*, 172 N. Y. 490, 65 N. E. 258. But see *Andrews v. Gold Meter Co.*, [1897] 1 Ch. 361. Restraints on the alienation of stock have uniformly been held invalid. *McNulta v. Corn Belt Bank*, 164 Ill. 427, 45 N. E. 954; *Bloede Co. v. Bloede*, 84 Md. 129, 34 Atl. 1127. And so with restrictions on the right of members to sue the corporation. *Insurance Co. v. Morse*, 20 Wall. (U. S.) 445; *MacMahon v. Sup. Tent, K. M. W.*, 151 Mo. 522, 52 S. W. 384; *Hope v. International Fin. Soc.*, 4 Ch. D. 327. A by-law which constitutes an unreasonable restraint of trade is also void. *Ipswich Tailors Case*, 11 Coke, 53 a; *Inter-Ocean Pub. Co. v. Associated Press*, 184 Ill. 438, 56 N. E. 822. The English courts give far wider scope to the corporate power of change than do the American courts, possibly because of the broad, inclusive language contained in Section 13 of the Companies Act. See 1 MACHEN, CORPORATIONS, § 721. It was not difficult, therefore, for the court to sustain the altered article in the principal case since it was intended as a reasonable protection of corporate interests and would undoubtedly have been sustained even in the United States.

**CORPORATIONS — STOCKHOLDERS: RIGHT TO SHARE IN CORPORATE ASSETS — TRANSFEREE OF STOCK FROM A WRONGFUL STOCKHOLDER.** — A stockholder